

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending; all stand rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1-5, 12-15, and 18 were rejected as unpatentable over Crook (USPA 2003/0177203) and Ladd (USPA 2004/0024897). Claims 6, 8-9, 11, 16-17, and 20 were rejected as unpatentable over Crook, Ladd, and Stuppy (USPA 2007/0184423). Claim 7 was similarly rejected further in view of Huetsch (USPA 2002/0049842). Claim 10 was similarly rejected further in view of Gifford (USPA 2003/0123622). Claim 19 was rejected as unpatentable over Crook, Ladd, and Gifford.

In this response, Applicants amend paragraph [0047] of the published application to correct a typographical error. Claims 1, 5, and 12 are also amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 1, 2, 12, and 13 are substantively amended to incorporate additional limitations that more clearly define and distinguish the invention over the cited prior art.

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Applicants assert that the prior art relied upon as the basis of the rejections fails to teach or suggest the feature of customizing content to be in a selected translated language. The specification supports this feature in at least two locations (referring now to the published version of the patent application), paragraphs [0033] and [0037], e.g. “Another customization menu, for example, may enable the user to select a language such as, for example, Spanish or French, to which to translate content.” and “The request may also include a language such as, for example, Spanish or French, to which to translate content.”

Regarding claims 2 and 13, Applicants assert that the prior art relied upon as the basis of the rejections fails to teach or suggest the feature of a time window during which content may be presented. The specification supports this feature in at least two locations (referring now to the published version of the patent application), paragraphs [0033] and [0038], e.g. “For example, ‘customization’ menus may be included which enable a user to specify a time window in which content or portions of content may be presented at presentation clients 130a-n. The time window may be defined by a start timestamp and a stop timestamp. The timestamp may be a value maintained by server 120. Such a time window is a security feature which may prevent unauthorized presentation of the content at an improper time.” Per paragraph [0038], the time window may be included in a conversion request as well.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 13-0019 referencing docket no. 128534-06201

(07028797). However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: May 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Marc D. McSwain

Registration No.: 44,929

Customer Number 26565

MAYER BROWN LLP

P.O. Box 2828

Chicago, IL 60690-2828

Telephone: (650) 331-2048

Facsimile: (650) 331-4548